arXiv:1005.2040v2 [math.FA] 21 Jul 2011

NONLINEAR VERSIONS OF A VECTOR MAXIMAL PRINCIPLE

MIHAI TURINICI

Abstract. Some nonlinear extensions of the vector maximality statement established by Goepfert, Tammer and Zălinescu [Nonl. Anal., 39 (2000), 909-922] are given. Basic instruments for these are the Brezis-Browder ordering principle [Advances Math., 21 (1976), 355-364] and a (pseudometric) version of it obtained in Turinici [Demonstr. Math., 22 (1989), 213-228].

1. Introduction

Let Y be a (real) separated *locally convex space*; and K, some *(convex) cone* of it: $\alpha K + \beta K \subseteq K$, $\forall \alpha, \beta \in R_+ := [0, \infty[$. In this case, the relation over Y

(a01) $(y_1, y_2 \in Y)$: $y_1 \leq_K y_2$ if and only if $y_2 - y_1 \in K$

is reflexive and transitive; hence a *quasi-order*; in addition, it is *compatible* with the linear structure of Y. Let H be another (convex) cone of Y with $K \subseteq H$; and pick some $k^0 \in K \setminus (-H)$. Further, take some complete metric space (X, d); and introduce the quasi-order (on $X \times Y$)

(a02) $(x_1, y_1) \succeq (x_2, y_2)$ iff $k^0 d(x_1, x_2) \leq_K y_1 - y_2$.

Finally, take some nonempty part A of $X \times Y$. For a number of both practical and theoretical reasons, it would be useful to determine sufficient conditions under which $(A, \succeq)$ has points with certain maximal properties. The basic 2000 result in the area obtained by Goepfert, Tammer and Zălinescu [9], deals with the case $H = \mathrm{cl}(K)$ (=the *closure* of K). Precisely, assume that

(a03) $P_Y(A)$ is bounded below (modulo K): $\exists \widetilde{y} \in Y$ with $P_Y(A) \subseteq \widetilde{y} + K$

(a04) if $((x_n, y_n)) \subseteq A$ is $(\succeq)$-ascending and $x_n \to x$ then $x \in P_X(A)$ and there exists $y \in A(x)$ such that $(x_n, y_n) \succeq (x, y)$, for all n.

[Here, for each $(x, y) \in A$, $A(x)$ (respectively, $A(y)$) stands for the *x-section* (respectively, *y-section*) of (the relation) A; and P_X, P_Y are the *projection* operators from $X \times Y$ to X and Y respectively].

Theorem 1. *Let the above conditions be in force. Then, for each $(x_0, y_0) \in A$ there exists $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in A$ with*

$$(x_0, y_0) \succeq (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \ [\textit{hence } y_0 \geq_K \bar{y}] \tag{1.1}$$

$$(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \succeq (x', y') \in A \ \textit{imply } \bar{x} = x'. \tag{1.2}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54F05 (Primary), 47J20 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Convex cone, quasi-order, maximal element, bounded set, (strictly) increasing and sub/super-additive function, Archimedean property, gauge function.

This result includes the ones due to Isac [10] and Nemeth [14] (which, in turn, extend Ekeland's variational principle [6]); and the authors' argument is based on the Cantor intersection theorem. Further, in his 2002 paper, Turinici [18] proposed a different approach, via ordering principles related to Brezis-Browder's [3] (cf. Section 2); and stressed that, conclusions like before are extendable to (non-topological) vector spaces Y under the choice $H = \mathrm{arch}(K)$ (=the *Archimedean closure* of K). It is our aim in this exposition to show that a further enlargement of these facts is possible (by the same techniques). This refers to the function

(a05) $\Lambda(t) = k^0 t,\ t \in R_+$ (where k^0 is the above one)

being no longer linear; details will be given in Section 4 (the Archimedean case) and Section 5 (the non-Archimedean case). The specific instrument of our investigations (in this last circumstance) is the concept of *gauge* function (developed in Section 3). Finally, in Section 6, the relationships between our statement and the recent variational principle in Bao and Mordukhovich [2] are discussed.

2. Brezis-Browder principles

(A) Let M be some nonempty set. Take a *quasi-order* $(\leq)$ over M; as well as a function $\psi : M \to R_+$. Call the point $z \in M$, $(\leq, \psi)$-*maximal* when: $w \in M$ and $z \leq w$ imply $\psi(z) = \psi(w)$. A basic result about such points is the 1976 Brezis-Browder ordering principle [3]:

Proposition 1. *Suppose that*

(b01) $(M, \leq)$ *is sequentially inductive:*
each ascending sequence has an upper bound (modulo $(\leq)$*)*

(b02) ψ *is* $(\leq)$*-decreasing* $(x \leq y \Longrightarrow \psi(x) \geq \psi(y))$.

Then, for each $u \in M$ *there exists a* $(\leq, \psi)$*-maximal* $v \in M$ *with* $u \leq v$.

This principle, including Ekeland's [6], found some basic applications to convex and nonconvex analysis (cf. the above references). So, a discussion about its key condition (b01) would be not without profit. Let $(Z, \leq)$ be some quasi-ordered structure. Take a function $\varphi : Z \to R \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$; and let M be some nonempty part of Z. For simplicity reasons, we let again φ stand for the restriction of φ to M. The following "relative" form of Proposition 1 will be useful for us.

Proposition 2. *Suppose (b02) holds (modulo* φ*), as well as*

(b03) φ *is inf-proper over* M*:*
$\inf[\varphi(M)] > -\infty$ *and* $\mathrm{Dom}(\varphi) := \{x \in M; \varphi(x) < \infty\} \neq \emptyset$

(b04) $\mathrm{Dom}(\varphi)$ *is sequentially inductive in* M*: each ascending sequence in* $\mathrm{Dom}(\varphi)$ *is bounded above in* M *(modulo* $(\leq)$*).*

Then, for each $u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\varphi)$ *there exists* $v \in \mathrm{Dom}(\varphi)$ *with*
i) $u \leq v$ *and* **ii)** $x \in M$, $v \leq x$ *imply* $\varphi(v) = \varphi(x)$.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\varphi)$ be arbitrary fixed. Put $M(u, \leq) := \{x \in M; u \leq x\}$; and introduce the function (from M to R_+) $\psi(x) = \varphi(x) - \varphi_*, x \in M$; where $\varphi_* := \inf[\varphi(M)]$. By the imposed conditions, Proposition 1 applies to $M(u, \leq)$ and $(\leq, \psi)$; wherefrom the conclusion is clear. □

For the moment, Proposition 2 is a logical consequence of Proposition 1. The reciprocal is also true, by simply taking $Z = M$, $\varphi = \psi$. Hence, these two results are logically equivalent. Note that the inf-properness condition (b03) is not essential

for the conclusion above (cf. Cârjă and Ursescu [4]). Moreover, $(R, \geq)$ may be substituted by a separable ordering structure $(P, \leq)$ without altering the conclusion above; see Turinici [19] for details. Further aspects were discussed in Altman [1]; see also Kang and Park [12].

(B) A semi-metric version of these developments may be given along the following lines. Let $(M, \leq)$ be taken as before. By a *pseudometric* over M we shall mean any map $e : M \times M \to R_+$. If, in addition, e is *reflexive* $[e(x,x) = 0, \forall x \in M]$, *triangular* $[e(x,z) \leq e(x,y) + e(y,z), \forall x,y,z \in M]$ and *symmetric* $[e(x,y) = e(y,x), \forall x,y \in M]$, we say that it is a *semimetric* (on M). Suppose that we fixed such an object. Call $z \in M$, $(\leq, e)$-*maximal*, in case: $w \in M$ and $z \leq w$ imply $e(z,w) = 0$. [Note that, if (in addition) e is *sufficient* $[e(x,y) = 0$ implies $x = y]$, this property becomes; $w \in M, z \leq w \Longrightarrow z = w$ (and reads: z is strongly $(\leq)$-maximal). So, existence results of this type may be viewed as "metrical" versions of the Zorn-Bourbaki principle]. To get such points, one may proceed as below. Call the (ascending) sequence (x_n) in M, e-*Cauchy* when $[\forall \delta > 0, \exists n(\delta)$: $n(\delta) \leq p \leq q \Longrightarrow e(x_p, x_q) \leq \delta]$; and e-*asymptotic*, provided $[e(x_n, x_{n+1}) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty]$. Clearly, each (ascending) e-Cauchy sequence is e-asymptotic too. The reverse implication is also true when all such sequences are involved; i.e., the global conditions below are equivalent:

(b05) each ascending sequence is e-Cauchy

(b06) each ascending sequence is e-asymptotic.

By definition, either of these will be referred to as $(M, \leq)$ is *regular* (modulo e). The following maximality result in Turinici [17] is available.

Proposition 3. *Assume that $(M, \leq)$ is sequentially inductive and regular (modulo e). Then, for each $u \in M$ there exists an $(\leq, e)$-maximal $v \in M$ with $u \leq v$.*

This result includes the Brezis-Browder ordering principle [3] (Proposition 1); to which it reduces in case $e(x,y) = |\psi(x) - \psi(y)|$ (where ψ is the above one). The reciprocal inclusion is also true; we refer to the quoted paper for details.

3. Conical gauge functions

Let Y be a (real) *vector space*. Take a convex cone L of Y (cf. Section 1); which, in addition, is *non-degenerate* $[L \neq \{0\}]$ and *proper* $[L \neq Y]$. Denote by $(\leq_L)$ its induced quasi-order (cf. (a01)); when L is understood, we indicate this as $(\leq)$, for simplicity. Further, let the map $\Lambda : R_+ \to L$ be *normal* (modulo L):

(c01) $\Lambda(0) = 0$ and Λ is strictly increasing (modulo L):
$\Lambda(\tau) - \Lambda(t) \in L \setminus (-L)$, whenever $\tau > t$

(c02) Λ is sub-additive: $\Lambda(t_1 + t_2) \leq \Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2)$, $\forall t_1, t_2 \in R_+$.

Note that, as a consequence of this,

$$\Lambda \text{ is strictly positive (modulo } L\text{): } \Lambda(t) \in L \setminus (-L), \forall t \in R_+^0 :=]0, \infty[\tag{3.1}$$

$$\Lambda \text{ is subtractive: } \Lambda(t_1 - t_2) \geq \Lambda(t_1) - \Lambda(t_2),\ \forall t_1, t_2 \in R_+,\ t_1 \geq t_2. \tag{3.2}$$

Having these precise, denote (for $y \in Y$)

(c03) $\Gamma(L; \Lambda; y) = \{s \in R_+; \Lambda(s) \leq y\}$, $\gamma(L; \Lambda; y) = \sup \Gamma(L; \Lambda; y)$.

(By convention, $\sup(\emptyset) = -\infty$). We therefore defined a couple of functions $\Gamma(.) := \Gamma(L; \Lambda; .)$ and $\gamma(.) := \gamma(L; \Lambda; .)$ from Y to $\mathcal{P}(R_+)$ and $R \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ respectively; the latter of these will be referred to as the *gauge* function attached to $(L; \Lambda)$. For the

particular case of *linear* normal functions [i.e., the one of (a05), with $k^0 \in L \setminus (-L)$], such objects were introduced (in the same context) by Turinici [18]; and these, in turn, appear as non-topological extensions of the locally convex ones in Goepfert, Tammer and Zălinescu [9]. The present developments may therefore be viewed as "nonlinear" extensions of the preceding ones.

i) To begin with, note that for each $y \in L$, $\Gamma(y)$ is *hereditary* ($s \in \Gamma(y) \Longrightarrow [0,s] \subseteq \Gamma(y)$). In addition, we have (by definition) $y \in L \Longleftrightarrow \Gamma(y) \neq \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow \gamma(y) \in [0,\infty]$) (or, equivalently: $y \notin L \Longleftrightarrow \Gamma(y) = \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow \gamma(y) = -\infty$).

ii) The gauge function is increasing [$y_1, y_2 \in Y$, $y_1 \leq y_2 \Longrightarrow \gamma(y_1) \leq \gamma(y_2)$].

iii) Further, γ is super-additive and subtractive:

$$\gamma(y_1 + y_2) \geq \gamma(y_1) + \gamma(y_2), \text{ whenever the right member exists} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\gamma(y_1 - y_2) \leq \gamma(y_1) - \gamma(y_2), \text{ if } \gamma(y_2)\text{=finite (hence } 0 \leq \gamma(y_2) < \infty). \tag{3.4}$$

Clearly, it will suffice proving the former one. Without loss, assume that $\gamma(y_1) > 0$, $\gamma(y_2) > 0$. By definition (and the hereditary property of Γ) $y_1 \geq \Lambda(t_1)$, $y_2 \geq \Lambda(t_2)$, whenever $0 \leq t_1 < \gamma(y_1)$, $0 \leq t_2 < \gamma(y_2)$; so, combining with (c02), yields (for all such (t_1, t_2)) $y_1 + y_2 \geq \Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2) \geq \Lambda(t_1 + t_2)$; that is, $\gamma(y_1 + y_2) \geq t_1 + t_2$. This, and the arbitrariness of the precise couple, ends the argument.

iv) Finally, the *identity* relation is available:

$$\gamma(\Lambda(t)) = t, \quad \text{for each } t \in R_+. \tag{3.5}$$

In fact, let $t \in R_+$ be arbitrary fixed; it will suffice verifying that $\Gamma(\Lambda(t)) = [0,t]$. Suppose not: there exists $\tau > t$ with $\tau \in \Gamma(\Lambda(t))$. By definition, $\Lambda(\tau) \leq \Lambda(t)$; wherefrom $\Lambda(\tau) - \Lambda(t) \in (-L)$; in contradiction to (c01). As a consequence, γ is *proper*; i.e., $\mathrm{Dom}(\gamma) := \{y \in Y; \gamma(y) < \infty\}$ is nonempty. Moreover, $\mathrm{Dom}_L(\gamma) := \mathrm{Dom}(\gamma) \cap L$ is nonempty too; and we have the decomposition $\mathrm{Dom}(\gamma) = (Y \setminus L) \cup \mathrm{Dom}_L(\gamma)$, with (in addition) $\gamma(Y \setminus L) = \{-\infty\}$, $\gamma[\mathrm{Dom}_L(\gamma)] = R_+$; as results from (3.5). On the other hand, by super-additivity, we have the *sup-translation* property: $\gamma(y + \Lambda(t)) \geq \gamma(y) + t$, $\forall y \in Y$, $\forall t \in R_+$. This inequality may be strict; just take $y = -\Lambda(\tau), t = \tau$, for some $\tau > 0$.

Concerning the effectiveness of such a construction, call the function $\psi : R_+ \to R_+$, *normal*, when $\psi(0) = 0$ and ψ is strictly increasing (on R_+) as well as sub-additive (see above). Note that such functions exist; such as, e.g.; $\psi(t) = t^\lambda$, $t \in R_+$, for some $\lambda \in]0,1]$. Suppose that $\{\psi_1, ..., \psi_m\}$ are endowed with such properties; and take some points $\{k^1, ..., k^m\}$ in $L \setminus (-L)$. Then, the function

(c04) $(\Lambda : R_+ \to L)$: $\Lambda(t) = k^1\psi_1(t) + ... + k^m\psi_m(t), \quad t \in R_+$

is a normal one, in the sense of (c01)+(c02). The obtained class of all these covers the linear one (expressed via (a05)); when (as precise) these developments reduce to the ones in Turinici [18]. Further aspects involving the locally convex (modulo Y) case (and the same linear setting) may be found in Goepfert, Riahi, Tammer and Zălinescu [8, Ch 3, Sect 10]. see also Gerth (Tammer) and Weidner [7].

4. Main result (Archimedean case)

With these preliminaries, we may now return to the question of the introductory part. Let Y be a (real) vector space; and K, some (convex) cone of it. Denote by $(\leq_K)$ the induced quasi-order (cf. (a01)). Let H be another (convex) cone of Y with $K \subseteq H$; and the map $\Lambda : R_+ \to K$ be *almost normal* (modulo (K,H)):

(d01) $\Lambda(0)=0$ and Λ is strictly increasing (modulo (K,H)):
$\Lambda(\tau)-\Lambda(t)\in K\setminus(-H)$, whenever $\tau>t$
(d02) Λ is sub-additive (modulo K):
$\Lambda(t_1+t_2)\leq_K \Lambda(t_1)+\Lambda(t_2)$, $\forall t_1,t_2\in R_+$.

Note that, as a consequence of this (cf. Section 3)

$$\Lambda \text{ is strictly positive (modulo } (K,H)\text{): } \Lambda(t)\in K\setminus(-H),\ \forall t\in R_+^0 \tag{4.1}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}\Lambda \text{ is subtractive modulo } K\text{):}\\ \Lambda(t_1-t_2)\geq_K \Lambda(t_1)-\Lambda(t_2),\ \forall t_1,t_2\in R_+,\ t_1\geq t_2.\end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

In addition, let (X,d) be a metric space. The relation over $X\times Y$

(d03) $(x_1,y_1)\succeq(x_2,y_2)$ iff $\Lambda(d(x_1,x_2))\leq_K y_1-y_2$

is reflexive and transitive (by the properties of Λ); hence a quasi-order on it. Finally, take some (nonempty) part A of $X\times Y$. As in Section 1, we are interested to determine sufficient conditions under which $(A,\succeq)$ has points with certain maximality properties. Note that, in the linear case of (a05), this problem is just the one in Turinici [18]; which (under d=complete) has a positive answer in the context of ((a04) and)

(d04) $P_Y(A)$ is bounded below (modulo H): $\exists\widetilde{y}\in Y$ with $P_Y(A)\subseteq\widetilde{y}+H$.

So, it is natural asking whether similar conclusions are retainable in our "nonlinear" setting. Loosely speaking, these depend on the ambient convex cone H being or not *Archimedean*. So, two alternatives are open before us.

In the following, we discuss the former of these, based on H being endowed with such a property (cf. Cristescu [5, Ch 5, Sect 1]):

(d05) $h,v\in H$ and $[h\tau\leq_H v,\forall\tau\in R_+^0]$ imply $h\in H\cap(-H)$.

As we shall see, a positive answer is available under

(d06) each $(\succeq)$-ascending e-Cauchy sequence $((x_n,y_n))\subseteq A$
is bounded above in A (modulo $(\succeq)$).

Here, e stands for the semi-metric on $X\times Y$ introduced as

(d07) $e((x_1,y_1),(x_2,y_2))=d(x_1,x_2)$, $(x_1,y_1),(x_2,y_2)\in X\times Y$.

The (first) main result of our exposition is

Theorem 2. *Let the assumptions (d04)-(d06) hold. Then, for each starting $(x_0,y_0)\in A$ there exists $(\bar{x},\bar{y})\in A$ with the properties (1.1) and (1.2) (written for our data).*

The latter of the conclusions above reads (under the precise convention)

$$(\bar{x},\bar{y})\succeq(x',y')\in A\Longrightarrow e((\bar{x},\bar{y}),(x',y'))=0.$$

This suggests us a possible deduction of Theorem 2 from Proposition 3. To see the effectiveness of such an approach, we need an auxiliary fact.

Lemma 1. *Let $((x_n,y_n))$ be an $(\succeq)$-ascending sequence in A:*

(d08) $\Lambda(d(x_n,x_m))\leq_K y_n-y_m$, *whenever* $n\leq m$.

Then, (x_n) is d-Cauchy in $P_X(A)$; hence $((x_n,y_n))$ is e-Cauchy in A.

Proof. **(Lemma 1)** Suppose that this would be not valid; i.e. (as d is symmetric), there must be some $\varepsilon>0$ in such a way that

(d09) for each n, there exists $m>n$ with $d(x_n,x_m)\geq\varepsilon$.

Inductively, we may construct a subsequence $(u_n = x_{i(n)})$ of (x_n) with $d(u_n, u_{n+1}) \geq \varepsilon$, for all n. This in turn yields, for the corresponding subsequence $(v_n = y_{i(n)})$ of (y_n), an evaluation like: $\Lambda(\varepsilon) \leq_K \Lambda(d(u_n, u_{n+1})) \leq_K v_n - v_{n+1}$, for each $n \geq 1$. But then, in view of (d04), one derives: $q\Lambda(\varepsilon) \leq_H v_1 - v_{q+1} \leq_H v_1 - \widetilde{y}$, for each $q \geq 1$. This, along with (d05), gives $\Lambda(\varepsilon) \in K \cap (-H)$; in contradiction with (4.1). Hence, the working assumption (d09) cannot hold; and the claim follows. □

Proof. **(Theorem 2)** Let $((x_n, y_n))$ be an $(\succeq)$-ascending sequence in A. By Lemma 1, $((x_n, y_n))$ is an e-Cauchy sequence in A; which tells us that $(A, \succeq)$ is regular (modulo e). Moreover, by (d06), $((x_n, y_n))$ is bounded above (modulo $(\succeq)$) in A; wherefrom, $(A, \succeq)$ is sequentially inductive. Summing up, Proposition 3 is applicable to $(A, \succeq; e)$; so that (from its conclusion) each $a_0 = (x_0, y_0)$ in A is majorized (modulo $(\succeq)$) by some $(\succeq, e)$-maximal $\bar{a} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ in A. This gives the conclusions (1.1)+(1.2) we need; and completes the argument. □

In particular, when Λ is taken as in (a05) (and d is complete) Theorem 2 is just the related statement in Turinici [18]; which, as precise there, incorporates the (locally convex) one in Goepfert, Tammer and Zălinescu [9] (Theorem 1). This inclusion seems to be strict; because the choice (c04) of Λ cannot be (completely) reduced to the linear one (appearing in all these papers). Some related aspects may be found in Tammer [16].

5. A completion (non-Archimedean case)

Now, the key regularity assumption used in the result above is (d05). So, it is natural to discuss the alternative of this being avoided. As we shall see below, a positive answer is still available; but we must restrict the initial set A in a way imposed by the associated (to H) gauge function.

Let Y be a (real) vector space; and K, some (convex) cone in it. Denote by $(\leq_K)$ its associated quasi-order; and let H be another (convex) cone of Y with $K \subseteq H$. We also take a map $\Lambda : R_+ \to K$; which is supposed to be almost normal (modulo (K, H)) in the sense of (d01)+(d02). Clearly, it is also normal (modulo H); so, we may construct the gauge function $\gamma : Y \to R \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ attached to (H, Λ), under the model of (c03). Further, letting (X, d) be a metric space, denote (again) by $(\succeq)$ the quasi-order on $X \times Y$ introduced as in (d03); and finally, let A be some (nonempty) part of $X \times Y$. The question to be posed is the same as in Section 4; to solve it, we list the needed conditions. The former of these is (again) (d04); which also writes

(e01) $P_Y(A) \subseteq H$ (i.e.: $\widetilde{y} = 0$ in that condition).

[For, otherwise, passing to the subset $A_0 = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y; (x, y + \widetilde{y}) \in A\}$, this requirement is fulfilled, via $P_Y(A_0) = P_Y(A) - \widetilde{y}]$. As a consequence, $\inf[\gamma(P_Y(A)] \geq 0$ (wherefrom γ is bounded below on $P_Y(A)$). However, the alternative $\gamma[P_Y(A)] = \{\infty\}$ cannot be avoided; so, we must accept (as a second condition)

(e02) $P_Y(A) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$ ($\gamma(y) < \infty$, for some $y \in P_Y(A)$).

A useful characterization of these is to be realized via the composed function $\Phi(x, y) = \gamma(y), (x, y) \in X \times Y$ (i.e.: $\Phi = \gamma \circ P_Y$). Precisely, let again Φ denote the restriction of this function to A; then, (e01)+(e02) may be written as

(e03) $\inf[\Phi(A)] \geq 0$ and $\mathrm{Dom}(\Phi) := \{(x, y) \in A; \Phi(x, y) < \infty\}$ is nonempty.

Now, the last condition to be imposed is a variant of (a04) above:

(e04) each $(\succeq)$-ascending e-Cauchy sequence $((x_n, y_n)) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi)$ is bounded above in A (modulo $(\succeq)$).

Here, e stands for the semi-metric over $X \times Y$ introduced as in (d07).

We are now in position to state the second main result in this exposition.

Theorem 3. *Let the precise conditions be in force. Then, for each* $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi)$ *there exists* $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi)$ *with the properties (1.1) and*

$$(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \succeq (x', y') \in A \text{ imply } \bar{x} = x',\ \gamma(\bar{y}) = \gamma(y'). \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. We claim that Proposition 2 is applicable to $(Z = X \times Y, \succeq)$, $M = A$ and $\varphi = \Phi$. In fact, by the remarks above $(x_1, y_1) \succeq (x_2, y_2)$ implies $\Phi(x_1, y_1) \geq \Phi(x_2, y_2)$; i.e., Φ is $(\succeq)$-decreasing. On the other hand, (e03) is just (b03) (with φ substituted by Φ). Finally, (e04) implies (b04) (with $\varphi = \Phi$); and this will establish our claim. In fact, let $((x_n, y_n))$ be an ascending sequence in $\mathrm{Dom}(\Phi)$; i.e.,

$$\Lambda(d(x_n, x_m)) \leq_K y_n - y_m, \text{ whenever } n \leq m.$$

Combining with the subtractivity of the gauge function (cf. Section 3) yields

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq \gamma(y_n - y_m) \leq \gamma(y_n) - \gamma(y_m), \text{ whenever } n \leq m.$$

The (real) sequence $(\gamma(y_n))$ is descending and bounded (by the choice of our data); hence a Cauchy one. This, added to the above, shows that (x_n) is a d-Cauchy sequence in $P_Y(A)$; or, equivalently, that $((x_n, y_n))$ is e-Cauchy in A; wherefrom (by (e04)) the claim follows. By Proposition 2 we therefore derive that, for $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi)$ there exists $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi)$ with the properties (1.1) and

$$(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \succeq (x', y') \in A \text{ imply } \Phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \Phi(x', y').$$

The relation in the left member of this implication yields (see the remarks above): $(x', y') \in \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi), d(\bar{x}, x') \leq \gamma(\bar{y}) - \gamma(y')$. Moreover, the relation in the right member of the same is just: $\gamma(\bar{y}) = \gamma(y')$; so that (combining these) $d(\bar{x}, x') = 0$; wherefrom $\bar{x} = x'$. This proves (5.1) as well; and concludes the argument. □

As before, when Λ is taken as in (a05) (and d is complete) Theorem 3 is nothing but the related statement in Turinici [18], obtained via similar techniques. [Moreover, when H is taken as in (d05), we have (cf. Section 3)

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\gamma) = H; \text{ hence } \mathrm{Dom}(\Phi) = A \text{ (in view of (e01))};$$

and Theorem 3 reduces to Theorem 2 above. But, in the general (nonlinear) setting, this is not true]. Further aspects (of locally convex nature) may be found in Isac and Tammer [11]; see also Rozoveanu [15]. For different structural extensions of these we refer to Khanh [13].

6. Further aspects

Our main results (Theorem 2 and Theorem 3) were especially designed to enlarge (in two distinct manners) the product variational principle in Goepfert, Tammer and Zălinescu [9]. Unfortunately, neither of these can extend in a direct way the related variational statements in Bao and Mordukhovich [2, Theorem 3.4]; for, e.g., the quasi-boundedness assumption imposed (by the authors) upon $x \mapsto A(x)$ is weaker than the boundedness condition (b04) used here. On the other hand, the cited results cannot extend Theorem 2 or Theorem 3; because the (a02)-type product quasi-order of the authors is the linear version (cf. (a05)) of the "nonlinear" product quasi-order (d03) used by us. Having these precise, it is natural to

ask whether a common extension of all these variational principles is available; we conjecture that the answer is positive.

References

[1] M. Altman, *A generalization of the Brezis-Browder principle on ordered sets,* Nonlinear Analysis, 6 (1982), 157-165.

[2] T. Q. Bao and B. S. Mordukhovich, *Relative Pareto minimizers for multiobjective problems: existence and optimality conditions,* Math. Program., 122 (2010), 301-347.

[3] H. Brezis and F. E. Browder, *A general principle on ordered sets in nonlinear functional analysis,* Advances Math., 21 (1976), 355-364.

[4] O. Cârjă and C. Ursescu, *The characteristics method for a first order partial differential equation,* An. St. Univ. "A. I. Cuza" Iaşi (S. I-a, Mat.), 39 (1993), 367–396.

[5] R. Cristescu, *Topological Vector Spaces,* Noordhoff Intl. Publishers, Leyden (The Netherlands), 1977.

[6] I. Ekeland, *Nonconvex minimization problems,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (New Series), 1 (1979), 443-474.

[7] C. Gerth (Tammer) and P. Weidner, *Nonconvex separation theorems and some applications in vector optimization,* J. Optim. Theory Appl., 67 (1990), 297-320.

[8] A. Goepfert, H. Riahi, C. Tammer and C. Zălinescu, *Variational Methods in Partially Ordered Spaces,* [Canad. Math. Soc. Books in Math. vol. 17], Springer, New York, 2003.

[9] A. Goepfert, C. Tammer and C. Zălinescu, *On the vectorial Ekeland's variational principle and minimal points in product spaces,* Nonlinear Analysis, 39 (2000), 909–922.

[10] G. Isac, *The Ekeland's principle and Pareto ε-efficiency,* in "Multi–Objective Programming and Goal Programming" (M. Tamiz ed.), pp. 148–163, L. Notes Econ. Math. Systems vol. 432, Springer, Berlin, 1996.

[11] G. Isac and C. Tammer, *Nuclear and full nuclear cones in product spaces: Pareto efficiency and an Ekeland type variational principle,* Positivity, 14 (2004), 1-28.

[12] B. G. Kang and S. Park, *On generalized ordering principles in nonlinear analysis,* Nonlinear Analysis, 14 (1990), 159-165.

[13] P. Q. Khanh, *On Caristi-Kirk's theorem and Ekeland's variational principle for Pareto extrema,* Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. (Math.), 37 (1988), 33-39.

[14] A. B. Nemeth, *A nonconvex vector minimization problem,* Nonlinear Analysis, 10 (1986), 669-678.

[15] P. Rozoveanu, *Ekeland's variational principle for vector valued functions,* Math. Reports [St. Cerc. Mat.], 2(52) (2000), 351-366.

[16] C. Tammer, *A generalization of Ekeland's variational principle,* Optimization, 25 (1992), 129-141.

[17] M. Turinici, *Metric variants of the Brezis-Browder ordering principle,* Demonstr. Math., 22 (1989), 213-228.

[18] M. Turinici, *Minimal points in product spaces,* An. Şt. Univ. "Ovidius" Constanţa (Ser. Math.), 10 (2002), 109-122.

[19] M. Turinici, *Brezis-Browder principles in separable ordered sets,* Libertas Math., 26 (2006), 15-30.

"A. Myller" Mathematical Seminar; "A. I. Cuza" University; 700506 Iaşi, Romania
E-mail address: mturi@uaic.ro